

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action currently outstanding with regard to the above-identified application, which Official Action the Examiner has designated as being FINAL.

Claims 1-4 and 6 were pending at the time of the issuance of the currently outstanding FINAL Official Action in the above-identified application. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6. In addition, Claim 2 has been canceled, without prejudice, and the subject matter thereof being to the remaining claims. Otherwise, no claims have been either added or withdrawn by the foregoing Amendment. Accordingly, in the event that the Examiner grants entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 as hereinabove amended will constitute the claims under active prosecution in this application.

The Claims of this application are reproduced above with appropriate status identifiers and showing the changes proposed by this Amendment as required by the Rules.

More particularly, in the currently outstanding non-final Official Action the Examiner has:

1. Does not re-acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC §119 (a)-(d) or (f), or reconfirm the receipt by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of the required copies of the priority documents – **Applicant respectfully notes for the record that these matters were previously acknowledged by the Examiner in the Official Action of 7 November 2007;**

2. Does not re-accept the formal drawings filed with the above-identified application on 6 January 2005 - **Applicant respectfully notes for the record that this matter as well was previously acknowledged by the Examiner in the Official Action of 7 November 2007;**

3. Objected to Claims 4-6 on the following grounds:

With respect to Claim 4, the Examiner suggests that the claim is directed to “anti-tampering signature system wherein display”, while line 21 of Claim 4 recites a limitation directed to an anti-tampering signature apparatus thereby rendering the claim unclear.

With respect to Claim 5, the Examiner suggests that the Applicant adopted an improper form in the cancellation of the claim.

With respect to Claim 6, the Examiner suggests that Applicant incorrectly copied the claim prior to the amendment thereof such that the preceding amendment of Claim 6 is improper for failure to include stricken out wording.

Applicant respectfully submit that the foregoing formal errors in Claims 5 and 6 as amended by the foregoing Amendment have been corrected hereinabove.

Futhermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 as amended hereinabove has removed any ambiguity that maight have heretofore existed as to whether Claim 4 is directed to a system or to an apparatus.

4. Indicated that Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley et al (US 2003/0217275) in view of Yankovich et al (US Patent No. 6,704,906).

Further comment regarding items 1-3 above is not deemed to be required in these Remarks.

With respect to item 4, on the other hand, Applicant by the foregoing Amendment proposes that Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 each be amended so as to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2. In this regard, Applicant respectfully notes that in the currently outstanding Official Action the Examiner has indicated that:

Claim 2 Yankosvich et al discloses an anti-tampering signature method for rewritable media according to claim 1 above, while neither of them explicitly disclose wherein in the extraction step, a general characteristic extracted from the image data generated by reading the display data is used as the characteristic quantity (paragraph [0022]).

Hideyoshi Yoshimura
Attorney Docket No. 62669 (48882)
USSN 10/520,717
Page 10

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing statement by the Examiner is a clear indication that the Examiner does not believe that the subject matter of Claim 2 either anticipates or renders obvious the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 as hereinabove amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2 now are in condition for allowance. Hence, reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendment and Remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants also believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 04-1105, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2008

David A. Tucker
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No.: 27,840

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
P.O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 21874

Boston, MA 02205